The Bolshevik Terror, Liberal Parallels and The Soviet Demise

tonyodarg.wordpress.com/2020/10/19/the-bolshevik-terror-liberal-parallels-and-the-soviet-demise

Tony Odarg October 19, 2020

Most criticisms of the Soviet Union come from fuddy-duddy conservatives who are upset the Soviets weren't liberal enough. Their criticisms amount to they were genocidal and they didn't like freedom (e.g. degeneracy). While these are certainly true, I'm unsure the later is all that bad. However, the horrors were pretty uncanny (from First Things):

> As the foremost historian of Russian terrorism, Anna Geifman, observes, "Robbery, extortion, and murder became more common than traffic accidents." Anyone wearing a uniform was a candidate for a bullet to the head or sulfuric acid to the face. Country estates were burnt down ("rural illuminations") and businesses were extorted or blown up. Bombs were tossed at random into railroad carriages, restaurants, and theaters. Far from regretting the death and maiming of innocent bystanders, terrorists boasted of killing as many as possible, either because the victims were likely bourgeois or because any murder helped bring down the old order. A group of anarcho-communists threw bombs laced with nails into a café bustling with two hundred customers in order "to see how the foul bourgeois will squirm in death agony."

And how did the liberals respond? Basically, the same way the elites do today:

> the Constitutional Democratic (Kadet) Party…advocated democratic, constitutional procedures, and did not themselves engage in terrorism, they aided the terrorists in any way they could. Kadets collected money for terrorists, turned their homes into safe houses, and called for total amnesty for arrested terrorists who pledged to continue the mayhem. Not just lawyers, teachers, doctors, and engineers, but even industrialists and bank directors raised money for the terrorists.

The reason why any revolution succeeds is because the elite support it, even if it comes for them:

> Why didn't the liberals and businessmen see it coming? That question has bothered many students of revolutionary movements. Revolutions never succeed without the support of wealthy, liberal, educated society. Yet revolutionaries seldom conceal that their success entails the seizure of all wealth, the suppression of dissenting opinion, and the murder of class enemies.

The academic class and academia in general was eerily similar to our own days:

> Professor Andozerskaya, who explains that she, like professors at many universities today, "must choose every word so carefully." In educated Russian society . . . by no means every view may be expressed. A whole school of thought . . . is morally forbidden, not merely in lectures but in private conversation. And the more "liberated" the company, the more heavily this tacit prohibition weighs on it.

Some historians have been asked whether the Soviet Union could have survived. Their answers are I think the key to White nationalist success (from History Today):

> ‘No one has suggested a convincing alternative scenario’
>
> – Rodric Braithwaite
>
> ‘Aimed at fixing the faults in Soviet society, Gorbachev’s policies emphasised them. The Soviet economy was not strong enough both to maintain a military system at superpower level and give its people a good standard of living.’
>
> – James Rodgers
>
> ‘In Soviet Kazakhstan, the scale of resistance took Moscow by surprise. The reformer Mikhail Gorbachev had recently come to power promising glasnost, so that his people could freely voice their opinions in a more tolerant Soviet Union. When the Kazakhs took to the streets to do that, Gorbachev sent in the security forces to quell the demos with bloodshed.’
>
> – Joanna Lillis
>
> ‘If the Communist Party had retained control of the media, it could, perhaps, have survived anything. Key to the survival of any dictatorship is strict control of the media, which shapes public opinion and promotes tacit acceptance of a regime.In his attempt to ‘open up’ society, Gorbachev permitted the press more freedom of expression.’
>
> – Richard Millington

I would you to think of these quotes as I go through my own summarized rundown of what these historians are saying. Also, keep the current American situation in mind. All of these responses point, I think, to several necessary steps before it is undermined.

First, the Empire itself must be delegitimized, meaning the people and the world must see it as increasingly incompetent. The inability to deal with emergencies and the rise of conspiracies theories are several examples. This is true in America. The American empire, especially the military, has never been more opposed worldwide and at home than at this point. Trump himself is hated by the security and intel state precisely because he ran against their interventionism.

Second, and as a result of the first, the Empire must be incapable of supporting its ever-expanding empire while providing its citizens a decent life. In other words, the military is opposed by too many and the middle class is dying. Any attempts by the elite to fix it only make it worse. This is also true in America. The middle class is completely gone and the American dream dead. The rich are getting richer and the 90% are saddled with debt and despair for their future. Suicide is rising. The efforts by the elites to fix this never work. The solutions proposed would cost trillions which would mean the military has to be massively defunded. The powers that be will never do that.

Third, the Empire underestimates its enemies. A good way to think of this is that the elites who run the Empire are so confident of their own approval among the masses that they don’t realize most normal people hate them. Not only that, but more and more people are turning to ideologies that fundamentally oppose the

Empire. This is true in America. The amount of young, White men who have turned to White Nationalism or are redpilled in major ways has grown. Racial unrest has never been more pronounced in decades and both political parties are more hated than ever.

Last, the media is not seen as illegitimate, but also information is no longer in the Empire's control. This is also true in America thanks to the Internet. No matter how much suppression of information is done by Big Tech and the MSM, the information gets out there. Alternative sites pop up to host video and other content and various sites are still selling books and blogging about the daily news. The mainstream media is more distrusted than Trump, which is amazing considering Trump is one of three presidents to be impeached and very unpopular compared to his recent predecessors.

All of these examples show not that communism is on the rise, but that liberalism is dying. All forms of liberalism are under scrutiny: capitalism, diversity, mass immigration, the taboo on White identity politics, modern Christianity, gay media and historical White guilt (e.g. slavery, holohoax, Indian genocide, CRT, etc). The liberal tyranny we have been living under is slowly dying. Hopefully, White people have the ability to rebuild in its ruins.

Links

First things: https://www.firstthings.com/article/2020/10/suicide-of-the-liberals
Archive: https://archive.vn/pNWFD

History today: https://www.historytoday.com/archive/head-head/could-soviet-union-have-survived
Archive: https://archive.vn/GP5g2

Thread: https://twitter.com/ramzpaul/status/1306271465139048450
Archive: https://archive.vn/eToNw